

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 15-25 remain in the application. Claims 1, 8, 15-16, and 20 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found at paragraphs 20 and 26 of the published patent application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 and 15-25 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Arnaiz et al. (US 7,080,371). "A rejection for anticipation under section 102 requires that each and every limitation of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference." In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Arnaiz neither teaches nor suggests a package comprising server configuration data comprising data to configure each of said servers for running said application. The upgrade kits of Arnaiz are not the same as server and application configuration data. Moreover, Arnaiz neither teaches nor suggests associating a server configuration with an application.

Claims 2-7 are not anticipated by Arnaiz at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

Independent claims 8, 15, 16, and 20 comprise the same limitations as claim 1 and are therefore not anticipated by Arnaiz for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by Arnaiz.

Claims 21-25 are not anticipated by Arnaiz at least by virtue of their dependence on

Serial Number 10/064,011
Docket Number CA920010048US1
Amendment Page 9 of 9

claim 20.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Buchenhorner

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

E-Filed on Date: October 22, 2007

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.
8540 S.W. 83 Street
Miami, Florida 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)